IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please add new Figure 1D to the drawing figures currently on file.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-36, which are all of the pending claims, over the prior art, principally U.S. Patent 6,563,515 (Reynolds, et al.). In particular, Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by Reynolds, et al., and Claims 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Reynolds, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,374,336 (Peters, et al.). The Examiner also objected to the specification and to the drawings.

With regard to the specification, the Examiner argued that the specification does not disclose the step of "generating a display, on a computer display screen, of a tree having a plurality of nodes; and embedding in the nodes information about the video-on-demand services."

Applicants respectfully note that this feature is described virtually verbatim in the Summary Section of the application, from page 4, line 30 to page 5, line 1. In view of this disclosure, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the specification.

With respect to the drawings, the Examiner noted that the above-discussed feature - generating a display, on a computer display screen, of a tree having a plurality of nodes; and embedding in the nodes information about the video-on-demand services – also is not shown in the drawings.

To address this issue, Applicants are submitting herewith an additional drawing showing Figure 1D that illustrates these features of the invention. Also, the Brief Description of the Drawings is being amended to include a brief description of Figure

1D, and the specification is being amended, at page 4. line 30, to include a specific reference to this Figure.

In view of these changes to the drawings and to the specification, the Examiner is respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

In addition, Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 be amended to better define the subject matters of these claims.

For the reasons set forth below, Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-36 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus asked to enter this Amendment, to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-36 and to allow these claims.

Generally, the pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art because that prior art does not disclose or suggest the feature of the administrator of a video-on-demand system interacting with nodes of a tree display or with a matrix to configure and to monitor the connections between the servers and the customers of the system, as described in independent Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 28 and 29. In order to best understand this difference and its importance, it may be helpful to briefly review this invention and the prior art.

The present invention, generally, relates to procedures for monitoring or representing aspects of video-on-demand services. In a first aspect, a tree representation is used to represent and monitor features of the video-on-demand system. Preferably, this aspect of the invention provides multilevel information about the video-on-demand system. A display showing a tree having a plurality of nodes may be generated, and information about video-on-demand services is embedded in these nodes. For example,

the nodes may be embedded with information about the equipment used to provide the video-on-demand services, the users, or the video-on-demand programs themselves. In this first aspect, a system administrator of the video-on-demand system interacts with the nodes to configure and to monitor the connections between servers of the system and the customers.

Pursuant to a second aspect of the present invention, a matrix is established from a pair of catalogs of elements of a video-on-demand system. Connection representations are formed for at least some of the cells of the matrix. These connection representations may be used to represent a range of relationships. For example, these connections may be used to show relationships between users and presentations, or between the video-on-demand equipment. In this second aspect of the invention, the system administrator interacts with the matrix cells to configure and to monitor the connections between the servers and customers of the system.

The references of record fail to disclose or suggest the above-described way in which the system administrator interacts with the displayed tree nodes or with the matrix cells to configure and to monitor the connections between the servers and the customers.

For example, Reynolds, et al. discloses a television program guide that supports a video window function that may be used when browsing for available television programs. A viewer may use the program guide to display a window that contains video for a program currently being broadcast on another channel or a video clip of a program to be shown in the future. The viewer may learn about available programming by browsing through channels on the program guide. Columns 11 and 12 of Reynolds, et al. describes a browser feature for programming that may be available on demand.

Peters, et al. describes a procedure for transferring multiple high bandwidth streams of data between multiple storage units. The Examiner cited Peters, et al. for its disclosure of storing different catalogs in different storage units. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Peters, et al, though, of enabling the administrator of a video-on-demand system to configure and to monitor customer connections by interacting with displayed tree nodes or matrix cells.

It is important to emphasize that there is a very important general difference between the present invention and the methods and systems disclosed in Reynolds, et al. This difference is that the instant invention is directed to configuring and monitoring connections between the servers of the video-on-demand system and the customers; while the Reynolds, et al. is directed more toward television programming guides that are viewed by individual customers.

In view of this important difference, it cannot be said that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to enable the system administrator to use the displayed tree nodes or matrix cells as they are used in the present invention.

Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 to better describe this feature of the invention. In particular, Claims 1, 6, 11 and 29 are being amended to describe the feature that the system administrator interacts with the nodes of the tree display to configure and to monitor the connections between the servers and customers of the video-on-demand system. Similarly, Claims 18 and 25 are being amended to indicate that the system administrator interacts with the matrix module or the matrix cells to configure and to monitor these connections.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, also do not disclose or suggest this feature of the present invention.

For example, Satterfield, et al. describes an interactive television program guide that may be used to show a browsing display screen. This browsing display screen includes a list of current programs, and a video window that shows a television program that the user is currently watching. An important feature of the Satterfield, et al. system is that the user can look at information about several programs without changing the program being shown in the video window.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2, 4, 5 and 34 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith; Claims 7, 9 and 10 are dependent from Claim 6 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 12-16 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 11.

In addition, Claims 19-23, 35 and 36 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 18; Claims 26-28 are dependent from Claim 25 and are allowable therewith; and Claim 30 is dependent from, and is allowable with, Claim 29. Also, Claims 17, 24 and 31 incorporate by reference, and are allowable with, Claims 1, 18 and 30 respectively. Claims 31-33 are dependent from Claim 30 and are allowable therewith.

The amendments requested herein only elaborate on features already described in the claims. For example, Claims 1, 6, 11, 18, 25 and 29 presently describe the tree nodes or a matrix, and these claims are being amended herein to describe the way in which

these tree nodes or matrices are used by the system administrator to configure and to monitor certain system connections. Accordingly, it is believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate and such entry is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the rejection of Claims 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow Claims these claims and new Claims 35 and 36.

For the reasons discussed above, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objections to the specification and to the drawings. The Examiner is also requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-36 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, and to allow these claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny

John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy
Enclosure: New drawing sheet adding Figure 1D